DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 411 557 CS 509 591

AUTHOR Keyton, Joann; Kear, Kelly Rae
TITLE College Students' Use of Affinity-Seeking Strategies in Attracting Romantic Others.
PUB DATE 1995-11-00
NOTE 23p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Speech Communication Association (81st, San Antonio, TX, November 18-21, 1995).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Students; *Communication Apprehension; Higher Education; Interpersonal Attraction; *Interpersonal Communication; Sex Differences
IDENTIFIERS *Affinity Seeking Strategies; *Communication Behavior

ABSTRACT

College students participated in a survey to determine the effect of dyadic communication apprehension and environmental setting on their selection of affinity-seeking strategies in introductory interactions with potential romantic partners. No gender effect was found. The subscale structure of affinity-seeking was not replicated indicating that use of affinity-seeking strategies in this situation may differ from others. Regardless of level of apprehension, college students used affinity-seeking strategies which focus in generalized interaction norms that belie the interaction motive. However, affinity-seeking strategies which require action and self-presentation skills were not selected by high apprehensives. Environmental setting had no effect on the selection of affinity-seeking strategies. (Contains 13 references and 6 tables of data.) (Author/RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 411 557

College Students' Use of Affinity-Seeking Strategies in Attracting Romantic Others

Joann Keyton, Ph.D.

Associate Professor
Department of Communication
University of Memphis
TCA 143
Memphis, TN 38152
901-678-3185
jkeyton@msuvx1.memphis.edu

and

Kelly Rae Kear

M.A. Student
Department of Communication
Texas A & M University

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Keyton

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CS505591

Paper presented to the Interpersonal and Small Group Division, Speech Communication Association Meeting, San Antonio, 1995. The authors thank the members of COMM 3330, Spring 1994 for their help in data collection.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

College Students' Use of Affinity-Seeking Strategies in Attracting Romantic Others

Abstract: College students participated in a survey to determine the effect of dyadic communication apprehension and environmental setting on their selection of affinity-seeking strategies in introductory interactions with potential romantic partners. No gender effect was found. The subscale structure of affinity-seeking was not replicated indicating that use of affinity-seeking strategies in this situation may differ from others. Regardless of level of apprehension, college students used affinity-seeking strategies which focus on generalized interaction norms that belie the interaction motive. However, affinity-seeking strategies which require action and self-presentation skills were not selected by high apprehensives. Environmental setting had no effect on the selection of affinity-seeking strategies.

Even with hundreds of eligible romantic partners available to them, college students have difficulty meeting people with whom they are physically attracted and might wish to have a romantic relationship. One college student complained that it was hard to meet potential partners. She had no trouble talking to a guy once she knew him or once she had been introduced to him by someone else. But when asked about approaching a guy she did not know with the hopes that they would eventually date, she countered, "Me, talk to him? No way!" She reported being scared and unsure of how to approach him and of what to say. Many college students report similar feelings of apprehensiveness. Even though opportunity may avail itself, introductory interaction with a person of the opposite sex with whom one wishes to date can be very difficult.

Uncertainty and Introductory Interactions

In one study, Douglas (1991) discussed the effects of global uncertainty on initial interactions. He found that uncertainty was an important indicator of what people think about and how they react to initial interactions. Those high in uncertainty found initial interactions to be more negative than those low in uncertainty. Douglas has explored the use of information seeking in initial interactions; however, he concludes that information strategies are not very efficient in creating liking in these settings. In another study, Douglas examined uncertainty, information seeking, and social attraction during initial conversation (1994). He suggested that uncertainty reduction is conversationally based, meaning that the more a couple talks, the less uncertain they become. He found no relationship between level of uncertainty and type of information seeking; however, those low in uncertainty sought more information. Finally, Douglas (1994) discovered that the amount of liking between interactants had no relationship to their ability to control uncertainty in initial interactions. These findings demonstrate how uncertainty pervades initial interactions. Douglas' research supports the project presented here. Uncertainty in an initial

interaction encompasses not only how a person feels about interactions in general, but also how a person feels about interactions with a specific person (Douglas, 1994). This type of uncertainty may be related to communication apprehension.

Communication Apprehension

Communication apprehension (CA) is a real or anticipated fear of actual or anticipated communication encounters. Low levels of CA indicate that people have little fear of communicating while high levels of CA indicate that people have a great fear of communicating. CA has been labeled as a trait meaning that high CAs will react apprehensively in any communication situation, while McCroskey (1984) and McCroskey and Beatty (1986) view CA situationally in that apprehension is generated in response to another person or group. Douglas states that certain people may exhibit communication apprehension when having to interact with certain people including a person one would like to know better or possibly someone one would like to date. While initiating conversation with a stranger is in itself anxiety-inducing, when that person is a potential romantic partner the stress may be heightened. Fear of communication with others should not be overlooked for its potential impact on relationship development.

Colby, Hopf, and Ayres (1993) report that people with high levels of CA feel less physically attractive, and believe themselves to be less competent, less confident, and less understood in certain settings. While self worth is not significantly related to CA, they found that high CAs exhibit behaviors that lessen their desirability and worth to interaction partners. In his own study Ayres (1989) found that high CAs perceive themselves to disclose less as well as be more negative, less honest and superficial, to interact less, have fewer dates, and to establish fewer close relationships in general. Finally, Hopf, Ayres, and Colby (1994) argue that high CAs have explicit difficulty in initial interactions as they perceive themselves to be less attractive, less trustworthy, less immediate, less dominant, less intimate, and less disclosing--all perceptions which could affect their interaction strategies when meeting potential romantic partners.

High CAs have a tendency to not only react negatively to initial interactions, but McCroskey (1984) and McCroskey and Beatty (1986) found that when people are confronted with an interaction circumstance that they believe will make them uncomfortable, they can choose to confront it and make

the best of it, or to avoid it and thus avoid the discomfort. Given the stressful situation of approaching an unknown other, understanding the effect of CA on the selection of affinity-seeking strategies is a worthwhile pursuit.

Affinity-Seeking

As defined by Bell and Daly (1984), affinity-seeking is the "active social-communicative process by which individuals attempt to get others to like and to feel positive toward them" (p. 92). They conclude that affinity-seeking is a strategic activity where individuals elicit liking from others through the manipulation of certain social behaviors, primarily talk. Historically, affinity-seeking research takes two forms. The first focused on a person's static characteristics, such as physical attractiveness or attitude similarity. The second focused on the strategic aspects of generating affinity emphasizing the social requirements and skills people use to be likable. Focusing on affinity-seeking as a communication skill, Bell and Daly assumed it was a strategic activity, and argued that various strategies were available to individuals in any interaction.

Bell and Daly (1984) developed a model situating affinity-seeking within an interaction process. The strategic activity of being liked is conditioned by antecedent factors affecting the goals and motives of the affinity-seeker. As such, the affinity-seeker operates within both personal and contextual constraints. A type of personal constraint is the affinity-seeker's level of communication apprehension while a contextual constraint is the setting where the affinity-seeking takes place. The strategic activity of affinity-seeking includes the selection, integration, and sequencing of strategies in addition to the quality with which the strategies are enacted. Bell and Daly argue that "the sequencing of strategies may be just as critical as the selection of the strategies" (p. 95). The process of affinity-seeking is only complete when the effect of the target is taken into account on affective, behavioral, and cognitive levels.

According to Bell and Daly's model of affinity-seeking, the strategies range from presentational strategies to controlling strategies to submissive strategies. Using self-report data and task or social environmental stimuli with same and higher status others to test their assumptions about affinity-seeking, Bell and Daly found that the "more likely people are to use affinity-seeking strategies, the more positively they are viewed by those who know them" (1984, p. 98). They also found that communication

apprehension was negatively related to the number of affinity-seeking strategies generated. Moreover, "as communication apprehension and social anxiety increase, there is also an increasing tendency to rely on strategies that place the other individual in charge of the interaction" (p. 103) demonstrating a practical implication of the relationship between communication apprehension and the ability to use affinity-seeking strategies. Because affinity-seekers are wanting to be well liked as well as attempting to discover more information about the other person, they may try a variety of strategies to gain the approval of the person to whom they are attracted and to get that person to feel more comfortable with the interaction event.

The affinity-seeking model developed by Bell and Daly produced eight clusters on three underlying dimensions--activity level of the affinity-seeking strategies, aggressiveness of the strategies, and focus of the strategies. These results prompted Bell and Daly to suggest that future research be studied as relationships develop in their intimacy and to examine data for effects of strategy selection and change as relationships develop. Surprisingly little work has furthered their model.

In strengthening casual acquaintances, Richmond, Gorham, and Furio (1987) found significant differences between college females and males in self-reported use of affinity-seeking strategies as well as differences in the types of strategies used. "These findings appear to characterize females as reactive and other-oriented and males as proactive and self-oriented" (p. 344). Within this college-age population, they found that both "males and females are inclined to perceive affinity-seeking interactions in cross-gender dyads as symmetrical interactions in which the other party would tend to mirror the behaviors most valued by themselves" (p. 345). Yet, little is known regarding which affinity-seeking strategies are used to initiate a relationship. Richmond et. al had participants recall persons with whom they had previously met and were casually acquainted. Bell and Daly's stimuli targets were also known others.

It is likely that selection of affinity-seeking strategies changes as relational outcomes differ (e.g., friend target vs. romantic target) and as the acquaintance deepens (e.g., no relationship vs. casual acquaintances vs. long-term relationships). College age populations are ideal for this type of investigation as college students are likely to be in active pursuit of social interaction and may perceive their campus as a primary environment for seeking the romantic attention of others. Prisbell (1988) concluded the while college life provides opportunities for developing dating relationships, some college

students face loneliness in this presumably opportunity-filled environment. Communication apprehension has been shown to be related to loneliness. Likewise, one's level of communication apprehension may become a barrier when seeking to be liked by others.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Two important factors have been missing from affinity-seeking research. First, there has been little variety in the types of affinity-seeking situations examined. Research to date has focused on casual acquaintances or known others rather than targets which the affinity-seeker wants to know but doesn't. Research has largely ignored the effect of communication apprehension in developing such relationships. Another aspect that could influence the use of affinity-seeking is the context in which the conversation occurs. Could a person be more apprehensive in noisy or quiet environments or when the target is isolated or with others? Testing affinity-seeking strategies in a variety of introductory interaction environments may help to confirm the situational presumption of communication apprehension.

The general research question that provides a foundation for the present study is: What is the effect of communication apprehension on affinity-seeking strategies? Thus, this study extends the research of Richmond, Gorham, and Furio (1987) who sought to detect gender differences in affinity-seeking choices used by college students in cross-gender dyads. Our review of the literature allowed us to develop the following hypotheses.

H1: Males prefer proactive and self-oriented affinity-seeking strategies while females prefer reactive and other-oriented affinity-seeking strategies.

H2: Individuals with high dyadic communication apprehension will use different affinity-seeking strategies than individuals with low dyadic communication apprehension.

H3: High dyadic communication apprehension will result in the avoidance of affinity-seeking strategies.

H4: The environment or surroundings of the target will affect the initiators choice of affinity-seeking strategies.

H4a: Initiators are more likely to use affinity-seeking strategies when the target is alone.

H4b: Initiators are more likely to use affinity-seeking strategies when the target is in quiet environments.

Methods

Participants

College students at a mid-south university volunteered to participate in the research project; no incentive was offered for participation. Of the 241 participants, 132 (55.5%) were female and 104 (44.1%) were male; their average age was 22.192 (sd=3.877). Participants were randomly assigned to four conditions of introductory interaction. Fifty-eight (24.0%) responded to the situation in which the target was alone in a quiet setting; 71 (29.5%) responded to the situation in which the target was with others in a quiet setting; 59 (24.5%) responded to the situation in which the target was alone in a noisy environment; and 53 (22.0%) responded to the situation in which the target was with others in a noisy environment. The quiet environment was a university library; the noisy environment was a dance club. Both environments were considered to be usual and appropriate for this population.

Procedure

Participants were given questionnaire packets which contained McCroskey's (1970) Personal Report of Communication Apprehension (PRCA) and 24 of the original 25 affinity-seeking items (Bell & Daly, 1984). The affinity-seeking strategy of Reward Association (presenting oneself so that the target perceiving the affinity-seeker can reward the target for associating with him or her) was not deemed appropriate for the introductory situation of this project. The stimulus was generalized for the communication apprehension scale while the stimulus statement was specific to one of the four conditions identified above for the affinity-seeking measure. Participants were instructed to think of a person of the opposite sex to whom they were attracted and had seen several times around campus, but had not met. Participants were instructed to think about what they would say or do in approaching this target person in one of the four environments. Responses for both measures were captured on 5-point Likert-type scales (very likely to very unlikely). The procedure is similar to that used by Richmond,

Gorham, and Furio (1987) except the target for this study was identified as someone the affinity-seeker had not met.

Independent Variables

Independent variables for the project were participant gender, level of dyadic communication apprehension, level of noise (dance club) or quiet (library) of the interaction environment, and the absence or number of people around the target individual (alone or with others).

Dependent Variables

The dependent variables were the likelihood of using the 24 affinity-seeking strategies and the number of strategies indicated. To provide an exhaustive range of possible interaction responses, an additional item asked if the respondent was likely to do nothing in this situation and became an additional dependent variable.

Results

Communication Apprehension

Dyadic apprehension was measured by the dyadic communication apprehension subscale of the PRCA measure. Six items comprise the subscale. The internal reliability for the subscale was .801. The subscale mean was 13.892 (sd = 4.1); scores ranged from 6 to 28. The dyadic subscale was deemed to a better predictor of apprehension for this project as it was more closely aligned to the situation presented to participants. King, Andersen, and Carlson (1988) suggest the overall PRCA score is not suitable for dyadic contexts given that the total score is heavily weighted toward contexts--public meeting, and group--which tend to be formal. The dyadic subscale resulted in moderate positive correlations (.538 to .728) with the other three dimensions of the PRCA (public apprehension, group apprehension, and meeting apprehension).

Likelihood to Use Affinity-seeking Strategies

The 24 affinity-seeking strategies were treated as eight subscales based upon Bell and Daly's (1984) model. The descriptive statistics for the subscales are shown in Table 1. Subscale correlations were not

insert Table 1 about here

computed as only two (Control and Visibility; Concern and Caring) of the eight subscales achieved the criterion internal reliability of .650. Items of the other subscales were renamed and treated independently in subsequent analyses (see Table 2). An alternative perspective for analyzing the likelihood to use

insert Table 2 about here

affinity-seeking strategies was afforded by totaling the number of strategies participants indicated they were "likely" or "very likely" to use. The descriptive statistics for this variable, labeled Number of Strategies, are also shown in Table 1. Finally, a single item asked participants how likely they would be to do nothing in the identified situation. This variable, labeled Do Nothing, is also shown in Table 1.

Predictive Models

Regression analyses with dyadic apprehension, participant gender, interaction location, number of people surrounding target, and interaction terms as independent variables were computed. For the dependent variable, Do Nothing, the model achieved significance ($F=2.81$, $p=.008$, $df=7,226$, $r^2=.08$) with dyadic apprehension accounting for .07 of the total variance. Thus, the likelihood of not using one of the 24 affinity-seeking strategies was predicted by participants' dyadic apprehension rather than environmental factors of the interaction situation. The effect of the same independent variables on the number of affinity-seeking strategies produced a significant model as well ($F=4.04$, $p=<.001$, df 8,227, $r^2=.125$) with dyadic communication apprehension accounting for 10.98% of the model's variance. As levels of CA increased, the number of strategies participants reported they would use decreased.

Two of the original affinity-seeking subscales (Control and Visibility; Concern and Caring) and the 13 single affinity-seeking strategies were subjected to similar regression analyses. Since the affinity-seeking strategies appeared to have little correlation with one another (see Table 2), each were treated in independent regressions. These results are summarized in Table 3. Dyadic communication apprehension was the significant predictor of likelihood to use affinity-seeking strategy(ies) in six of 15

insert Table 3 about here

models. In each of these significant models, increased dyadic communication apprehension resulted in a decreased likelihood to use affinity-seeking strategies. Gender of participant and the environmental variables (location of interaction, isolation of interaction target) were weak predictors of the likelihood to use particular strategies. The number of people around the interaction target achieved significance in the model for the affinity-seeking strategy of Influence Perceptions of Closeness. Participants responding to the isolated target scenario were less likely to use this affinity-seeking strategy than participants responding to the scenario in which the interaction target was with others (alone=2.376; with others=2.856). The interaction term of location by number of people surrounding the interaction target achieved significance for the affinity-seeking strategy of Concede Control. Females were less likely to use this strategy when the target was alone and more likely to use this strategy when the target was with others; the reverse was true for male participants.

Due to the cumbersome nature of testing 15 measures of affinity-seeking, additional analyses were pursued to maximize the parsimony of the affinity-seeking strategy structure. The 24 items were factor analyzed using principal component analysis. The initial scree test indicated that four factors dominated the model. After rotation and the elimination of weakly loading items, 22 were retained and renamed as usable subscales of affinity-seeking strategies. The factor structure is displayed in Table 4. Factors were kept if they met a .4 criterion and discriminated among factors loading only a single factor or double factors. These factor structures were then examined for logic and consistency. Two of the original affinity-seeking strategies--Altruism and Supportiveness--did not load on any of the four factors in this contextual study of introductory interaction.

The first factor is labeled Nice and Polite and includes eight general affinity-seeking strategies

insert Table 4 about here

that people typically use when meeting someone whether or not they're attracted to the target romantically. This factor accounted for 14.64% of the variance. The second factor, Active, accounted for 10.96% of the variance. It includes four strategies college-age participants are likely to use due to their romantic interest in the target other. The third factor consists of five items and accounted for 9.81% of the variance. This factor, named Outgoing, includes affinity-seeking strategies in which the affinity-seeker acts both positively and proactively in engaging the target person. The fourth factor was named Later Strategies because it consisted of six affinity-seeking strategies which are likely to be used in interaction as a relationship develops. This factor accounted for 8.56% of the variance.

Regression analyses were computed for the four factors of Nice and Polite, Active, Outgoing, and Later Strategies. The descriptive statistics for these variables are shown in Table 5. The low-to-moderate correlations among the revised subscales suggest that affinity-seeking strategies have different uses and functions. With respect to the regression analysis, the second and third factors--Active

---

insert Table 5 about here

---

and Outgoing--produced significant models. The results are summarized in Table 6. In the Active model, dyadic communication apprehension was the only significant contributor and accounted for 13.7% of the

---

insert Table 6 about here

---

model's variance. In the Outgoing model, the environment of the interaction accounted for 1.8% of the variance while dyadic communication apprehension accounted for 17.5% of the variance.

Discussion

Several interesting findings resulted. First, this study did not support Richmond, Gorham, and Furio's (1987) gender difference in affinity-seeking selection; thus, hypothesis one is rejected. Our data did not explicate affinity-seeking differences for males and females. Perhaps, in part, the behavioral shift of male and female roles (Pearson, 1985) has occurred. An alternative explanation is that male and female stereotypes do not emerge in introductory interactions where the initiator is testing the possibility of a romantic relationship. Since the affinity-seeker has little information about the target, affinity-seekers may

rely upon behavioral patterns that fit more generalized interaction norms rather than male-female stereotypical patterns. The initiator may feel that generalized interaction norms may be more effective given the tenuous nature of the potential relationship. If, after introduction, the affinity-seeker changes his/her mind about wanting to develop a relationship with the target, generalized interaction behaviors may not reveal to the target that he/she was being considered as a potential romantic other. If this is the case, using generalized interaction patterns in introductions may be strategic face-saving. Richmond, Gorham and Furio's (1987) research does illustrate that male-female stereotypical patterns may surface as the relationship develops.

The original factor structure proposed by Bell and Daly did not withstand this contextual test of affinity-seeking strategies. However, significant results in the revised and alternative factor structures do allow the hypotheses to be satisfied. Overall, we were interested in examining the impact of dyadic communication apprehension on the use of affinity-seeking strategies. Hypothesis two suggested that high dyadic communication apprehensives would use different affinity-seeking strategies than low dyadic communication apprehensives. Regression analyses demonstrated that dyadic communication apprehension accounted for different use patterns for six of the fifteen affinity-seeking strategies. Specifically, low communication apprehensives were more likely to use strategies of Control and Visibility, Trustworthiness, Concern and Caring, Facilitating Enjoyment, Being Comfortable with Self, and Optimism. It is likely that individuals with low dyadic communication apprehensive would be more capable of facilitating these interaction strategies than those with high dyadic communication apprehension. In the remaining models where dyadic communication apprehension is not a significant contributor, we could argue that these strategies--Openness, Trustworthiness, Conversational Rule Keeping, Inclusion of Others, Nonverbal Immediacy, Self-Inclusion, Influence Perceptions of Closeness, Assume Equality, and Similarity--are more typical of general interaction managment and thus, would be less reliant on the initiator's level of apprehension.

With respect to the alternative factor structure, dyadic communication apprehension affected the affinity-seeking strategies of the Active and Outgoing factors. The first factor, Nice and Polite, represents more generalized interaction strategies, ones most people would have experience with in a variety of

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

settings. The affinity-seeking strategies found in Active and Outgoing are likely to require more strategy specific to the target and more confidence with one's self. One explanation for not finding a significant effect in the Later Strategies could be that by the time these strategies are invoked, high and low communication apprehensives have approached the target in alternative forms, but still reach the stage of interaction where sharing information about tastes, attitudes, and beliefs can be effective. Thus, hypothesis two is partially supported; high dyadic communication apprehensives use some different strategies than low dyadic communication apprehensives.

Support for the alternative factor structure of the affinity-seeking strategies is realized by examining the underlying dimensions of Bell and Daly's (1984) original factor structure. In their initial studies, they found that three dimensions surfaced as a foundation among the affinity-seeking strategies--active/passive, aggressive/unaggressive, and self-oriented/other-oriented. In our revised factor structure, the Nice and Polite factor contains three items that loaded on the original other-oriented, unaggressive, and passive dimensions and one item which loaded on the unaggressive dimension. This helps substantiate our claim about the strategy of seeking affinity with potential romantic targets in a generalized fashion as to not be blatant about one's romantic intention or pursuit. Our second factor, labeled Active, consists of three items which loaded on Bell and Daly's self-oriented, aggressive, and active dimensions. This helps substantiate our claim that low dyadic communication apprehensives select strategies that require more overt action on the part of the initiator.

Hypothesis three suggested that high dyadic communication apprehensives would be more likely to avoid affinity-seeking interaction than low communication apprehensives. This hypothesis was supported although the amount of variance accounted for was low. Similarly, dyadic communication apprehension affected the number of strategies one would use in the introductory situations presented. The more apprehensive the initiator of the interaction, the fewer strategies he/she reported likely to use. This leads us to believe that a person who has a fear of an dyadic encounter will do one of two things. They will use only a few affinity-seeking strategies because they either know that they can only facilitate a few successfully, or that only a few affinity-seeking strategies exist in their behavioral repertoire. This follows Bell and Daly's (1984) finding that individuals who used many affinity-seeking strategies were perceived

as more likable, socially successful, and satisfied with their lives. These results point to the tangible relationship of communication apprehension and the use of affinity-seeking strategies. It appears that communication apprehension has a stronger influence on people and their strategic affinity-seeking behavior than expected. Still unanswered, however, is which precedes the other? Are high dyadic CAs unable to use affinity-seeking strategies due to their anxiety or are people who have fewer affinity-seeking strategies from which to choose from apprehensive due to their limited interaction repertoire?

Hypothesis four suggested that environmental factors of the interaction would affect the selection of affinity-seeking strategies. This hypothesis was not supported. Of regression analyses for both the revised and alternative factor structures, environmental factors regarding type of location and number of people surrounding the target predicted use of strategies in only three models, each accounting for small amounts of variance. Thus, it appears that for college students who are interested in meeting a romantic partner, environmental factors play an insignificant part in selecting strategies for introductory interaction. For college students apprehensive about meeting potential romantic partners, situations surrounding a potential romantic target are not evaluated for their interaction potential, as communication apprehension overrides situational influences. The opposite appears to hold true for low apprehensives. Regardless of the situational environment of the target, low apprehensives appeared ready and willing to strategically interact with a potential romantic partner. Unlike other populations who may be more accustomed to restricting romantic introductions to specific environments, it appears that non-apprehensive college students will use the same affinity-seeking strategies to meet a potential romantic partner wherever the chance or occasion arises.

The revised factor structure suggests an additional interpretation of affinity-seeking strategies for college students wishing to interact with someone to whom they are attracted. Level of dyadic communication apprehension did not affect the introductory affinity-seeking strategies one might use or the later strategies one might use to seek the romantic attraction of the target. This interpretation may be unique to college students. These results suggest that college students may start with generalized affinity-seeking strategies. Those without dyadic communication apprehension continue with affinity-seeking strategies which are active, demonstrate their confidence with the interaction and further follow-

up with strategies which demonstrate their outgoing nature. College students with increased dyadic communication apprehension may start with the same generalized affinity-seeking strategies, but become deterred in their efforts or use a path different from the affinity-seeking strategies of the Active and Outgoing variables to move the interaction to the level in which Later Strategies seem appropriate.

A major point that needs to be addressed is why the Bell and Daly model did not hold in this study of introductory interaction. We believe the main reason for our alternative affinity-seeking structure is the over reliance on research designs which assume that dyads had been already been acquainted. To extend our knowledge of affinity-seeking and the effects of communication apprehension on affinity-seeking selection, our stimuli detailed a situation in which the two people had never spoken or been introduced to each other. It stands to reason that if a person knows someone or has a basic knowledge of their likes and dislikes, the selection and the order in which they would use affinity-seeking strategies would be different than if they had never met the person and had no prior knowledge of their likes and dislikes.

References

Ayres, J. (1989). The impact of communication apprehension and interaction structure on initial interactions. Communication Monographs, 56(1), 75-88.

Bell, R. A., & Daly, J. A. (1984). The affinity-seeking function of communication. Communication Monographs, 51(2), 92-114.

Colby, N., Hopf, T., & Ayres, J. (1993). Nice to meet you? Inter/Intrapersonal perceptions of communication apprehension in initial interactions. Communication Quarterly, 41(2), 221-230.

Douglas, W. (1991). Expectations about initial interaction: An examination of the effects of global uncertainty. Human Communication Research, 17(3), 355-384.

Douglas, W. (1994). The acquaintance process: An examination of uncertainty, information seeking, and social attraction during initial conversation. Communication Research, 21(2), 154-176.

Hopf, T., Ayres, J., & Colby, N. (1994). Using visualization to reduce communication apprehension in initial interaction: A brief report. Communication Reports, 7(1), 57-59.

King, S. W., Andersen, J., & Carlson, B. R. (1988). The dimensionality of the PRCA-24: An explication of context dimensions. Communication Reports, 1(1), 1-8.

McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. Speech Monographs, 37, 296-277.

McCroskey, J. C. (1984). The communication apprehension perspective. In J. A. Daly & J. C. McCroskey (Eds.), Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence and communication apprehension (pp. 13-38). Beverly Hills: Sage Publications.

McCroskey, J. C., & Beatty, M. J. (1986). Oral communication. In W. Jones, J. Cheek, & S. Briggs (Eds.), Shyness: Perspectives on research and treatment (pp. 279-293). New York: Plenum Press.

Pearson, J. C. (1985). Gender and communication. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.

Prisbell, M. (1988). Dating competence as related to levels of loneliness. Communication Reports, 1(2), 54-59.

Richmond, V. P., Gorham, J. S., & Furio, B. J. (1987). Affinity-seeking communication in collegiate female-male relationships. Communication Quarterly, 35(4), 334-348.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics of Affinity-Seeking Variables (Original Subscale Structure)

Variable	# of items	Mean	Standard Dev.	Internal Reliability
Control & Visibility	5	20.050	3.064	.687
Trust	2	7.199	1.317	.054
Politeness	2	7.249	1.456	.350
Concern & Caring	6	24.429	3.769	.763
Other Involvement	3	11.390	2.095	.505
Self Involvement	2	6.315	1.623	.259
Commonalties	3	10.525	1.991	.372
Optimism	1	4.183	.787	
# of Strategies		17.083	3.687	
Do Nothing		2.429	1.148	

n=241

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics of Affinity-Seeking Variables (Revised Structure)

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1 Control & Visibility		.155[1]	.362[2]	-.187[2]	.280[3]	.448[3]	.399[3]	.265[3]	.316[3]	.240[3]	.232[3]	.090	.304[3]	.193[2]	.472[3]
2 Openness[a]			.028	.120	.156[1]	.156[1]	.124	.053	.159[1]	.154[1]	.233[3]	.206[2]	.029	.117	.028
3 Trustworthiness[a]				-.050	.348[3]	.453[3]	.326[3]	.182[2]	.119	.112	-.006	.076	.068	.133[1]	.382[3]
4 Concede Control[b]					.209[2]	.187[2]	-.003	.079	-.034	.045	-.049	.090	-.098	.019	.008
5 Conversational Rule Keeping[b]						.547[3]	.219[3]	.264[3]	.041	.121	-.081	.0834	.049	.129[1]	.357[3]
6 Concern & Caring							.407[3]	.353[3]	.263[3]	.230[3]	.020	.218[3]	.134[1]	.180[2]	.432[3]
7 Facilitates Enjoyment[c]								.355[3]	.240[3]	.190[2]	.130[1]	.077	.204[3]	.183[2]	.281[3]
8 Inclusion of Others[c]									.185[2]	.317[3]	.016	.111	.072	.143[1]	.209[2]
9 Nonverbal Immediacy[c]										.316[3]	.188[2]	.191[2]	.269[3]	.178	.108
10 Self-Inclusion[d]											.149[1]	.168[2]	.137[1]	.239[3]	.164[1]
11 Influence Perceptions of Closeness[d]												.305[3]	.222[3]	.305[3]	.031
12 Assume Equality[e]													.106	.203[2]	.020
13 Comfortable Self[e]														.186[2]	.149[1]
14 Similarity[e]															.205[2]
15 Optimism															
Mean	20.03	2.87	4.34	3.05	4.18	24.40	3.96	3.98	3.47	3.70	2.62	3.29	3.72	3.52	4.18
Standard Deviation	3.06	1.08	.70	1.09	.75	3.26	.85	.93	1.09	1.05	1.07	1.06	.98	.93	.79

Original Subscale Structure
[a]=Trust
[b]=Politeness
[c]=Other Involvement
[d]=Self Involvement

Original Subscale Structure (cont.)
[e]=Commonalities

[1]=significant at .05
[2]=significant at .01
[3]=significant at .001

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 3

Summary of Regression Analyses

Variable	F value	prob.	r^2	sig. contributor	%
Control & Visibility	7.93	<.001	.270	dyadic app	.179
Openness	1.33	.238	.040		
Trustworthiness	1.55	.150	.047		
Concede Control	2.22	.033	.066	dyadic app	.022
				sit*gender	.030
Conversational Rule Keeping	1.14	.337	.035		
Concern & Caring	2.17	.038	.064	dyadic app	.045
Facilitate Enjoyment	4.22	<.001	.118	dyadic app	.103
Inclusion of Others	1.93	.066	.058		
Nonverbal Immediacy	1.91	.070	.057		
Self-Inclusion	.88	.522	.027		
Influence Perceptions of Closeness	2.58	.014	.075	# of people	.034
Assume Equality	1.43	.196	.043		
Comfortable Self	5.78	<.001	.154	dyadic app	.122
Similarity	1.70	.111	.051		
Optimism	4.12	<.001	.115	dyadic app	.091

n=230; df=7,222

Table 4

Revised Factor Structure for Affinity-Seeking Items

Variable	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Control and Visibility				
Assume Control	.067	.416	.531	.053
Dynamism	.210	.689	.220	.007
Personal Autonomy	.079	.179	.705	-.044
Physical Attractiveness	.126	.597	-.016	.081
Present Interesting Self	.228	.557	.258	.145
Reward Association	.177	.132	-.172	.430
Trust				
Openness	.413	.173	.444	-.053
Trustworthiness	.440	-.432	-.211	.182
Politeness				
Concede Control	.657	.013	.249	-.010
Conversational Rule Keeping	.625	.009	.112	.174
Concern and Caring				
Altruism	.363	.304	.257	.028
Elicit Other's Disclosure	.564	-.069	.432	.030
Listening	.669	.239	.083	-.012
Self-concept Confirmation	.723	.092	.078	.104
Sensitivity	.621	.346	.039	.146
Supportiveness	.321	.349	.291	.173
Other Involvement				
Facilitate Enjoyment	.305	-.044	.438	.302
Inclusion of Other	.119	.429	.108	.408
Nonverbal Immediacy	.055	-.014	.397	.583
Self Involvement				
Self-Inclusion	-.174	.358	-.107	.589
Influence Perceptions of Closeness	.159	.002	-.088	.599
Commonalties				
Assume Equality	-.066	.512	.112	.217
Comfortable Self	.010	.090	.222	.596
Optimism	.307	.246	.575	-.034
% of variance	14.64	10.96	9.81	8.56
Factor Name	Nice & Polite	Active	Outgoing	Later Strategies

original factor structure in bold
revised factor structure underlined

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics of Alternative Factor Structure

	1	2	3	4
1 Nice & Polite		.281	.529	.252
2 Active			.491	.416
3 Outgoing				.255
4 Later Strategies				
Mean	31.913	15.758	20.458	19.483
Standard Deviation	4.029	2.512	2.789	3.660
# of Items	8	4	5	6

n=240
all correlations significant <.001

Table 6

Summary of Regression Analyses (Alternative Factor Structure)

Variable	F value	prob.	r^2	sig. contributor	%
Nice & Polite	1.00	.430	.030		
Active	5.66	<.001	.149	dyadic app	.137
Outgoing	8.43	<.001	.206	environment	.018
				dyadic app	.175
Later Strategies	0.96	.458	.029		